

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 010929

22

ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 IO-11 AF-06 ARA-06 EA-07 EUR-12 CIAE-00

DODE-00 PM-04 H-02 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01

PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 OMB-01 SAM-01 SAB-01

SCCT-01 /103 R

DRAFTED BY NEA:ALATHERTON, JR./HLK

APPROVED BY NEA - ALFRED L. ATHERTON, JR.

IO:JABAKER

ARA:GMONSMA

AF:JWHITING

EUR:REWING

EA:LMCNUTT

----- 123029

R 160052Z JAN 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO ALL DIPLOMATIC POSTS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 010929

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, XF, US

SUBJECT: U.S. POSITION IN CURRENT UNSC DEBATE ON MIDDLE  
EAST

KUWAIT POUCH BAGHDAD

1. FOLLOWING IS GENERAL GUIDANCE ON U.S. APPROACH TO UNSC  
DEBATE ON MIDDLE EAST WHICH YOU MAY DRAW ON IN DISCUSSIONS  
WITH HOST OFFICIALS TO EXTENT YOU CONSIDER IT WOULD BE  
HELPFUL AND APPROPRIATE.

2. WE BELIEVE THAT CAUSE OF PEACE WOULD NOT BE SERVED BY  
A NEGATIVE DEBATE THAT WOULD PUT FURTHER OBSTACLES IN PATH  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 010929

TOWARD PEACE. WE THEREFORE APPROACH UNSC MEETING WITH

STRONG HOPE THAT DEBATE WILL BE CONSTRUCTIVE AND STRENGTHEN, RATHER THAN UNDERMINE, FOUNDATIONS FOR FURTHER POSITIVE MOVES TOWARD PEACE.

3. THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY HAD OCCASION LAST WEEK TO DISCUSS THE VARIOUS ISSUES WITH OUR AMBASSADORS TO EGYPT, JORDAN AND SYRIA, WHO HAVE RETURNED TO POSTS TO CONTINUE OUR DIALOGUE WITH THOSE GOVERNMENTS.

4. U.S. VIEWS THE UNSC MEETING IN THE LARGER CONTEXT OF EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE A SETTLEMENT OF THE MIDDLE EAST PROBLEM. MUCH PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN THE PAST TWO YEARS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK PROVIDED BY SC RESOLUTIONS 242 AND 338 AND THE GENEVA ARRANGEMENTS. WE HAVE TRIED TO VISUALIZE THE SECURITY COUNCIL AS A USEFUL NEGOTIATING FORUM, BUT HAVE BECOME CONVINCED THAT IT IS NOT THE PROPER ONE TO MOVE THE PEACE PROCESS FORWARD IN THE LIGHT OF THE VARIOUS OBSTACLES TO POSITIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE DISCUSSIONS IN THE SC WHICH EXIST -- E.G., THE PARTICIPATION OF COUNTRIES WITHOUT A DIRECT ROLE IN OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE EFFORTS AND THE TENDENCY TO TAKE EXTREME PUBLIC POSITIONS RATHER THAN SEARCH FOR COMPROMISE AND ACCOMMODATION. WE ARE CONCERNED THAT THE SC SESSION HAS, INDEED, A SERIOUS POTENTIAL TO INTERFERE WITH CONTINUED PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE, AND ONE OF OUR PRINCIPAL CONCERNS IS TO AVOID SUCH A RESULT. IT IS PRECISELY BECAUSE THE U.S. IS DETERMINED TO GENERATE PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS FOLLOWING THE SC MEETING THAT WE ATTACH SUCH IMPORTANCE TO PRESERVING THE ONLY EXISTING AND ACCEPTED FRAMEWORK FOR THOSE NEGOTIATIONS. IF THAT FRAMEWORK, SO CAREFULLY CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1967, IS ALTERED IN WAYS UNACCEPTABLE TO ONE OR ANOTHER OF THE PARTIES, WE SEE NO POSSIBILITY OF DEVISING AN AGREED REPLACEMENT FOR IT.

5. THE U.S. POSITION IS THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO OPPOSE ANY RESOLUTION THAT ATTEMPTED TO ALTER ADVERSELY OR AMPLIFY, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THE AGREED BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS, SC RESOLUTIONS 24, AND 338. TO GO BEYOND THOSE RESOLUTIONS AT THIS TIME WOULD TEND TO UNDO MUCH CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 010929

OF THE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS THAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED, AND WE WOULD HAVE TO OPPOSE IT. TO UNDERMINE THE 242 AND 338 FRAMEWORK WOULD, FOR EXAMPLE, DIMINISH THE PROSPECTS FOR AN EARLY RENEWAL OF THE GENEVA CONFERENCE, WHICH HAS BEEN -- AND REMAINS -- A U.S. OBJECTIVE. WE ARE OF COURSE RESERVING JUDGMENT ON HOW WE WOULD VOTE UNTIL WE SEE WHAT KIND OF RESOLUTION LANGUAGE IS PROPOSED.

6. IN REGARD TO THE PALESTINIANS, THE U.S.VIEW HAS BEEN, AND IS, THAT THERE CAN BE NO MIDDLE EAST SETTLEMENT THAT DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE LEGITIMATE INTERESTS OF ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE AREA, INCLUDING THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE. IT IS OUR VIEW, HOWEVER, THAT THESE INTERESTS MUST BE DEALT WITH IN THE CONTEXT OF NEGOTIATIONS AMONG THE PARTIES AND NOT PREJUDGED IN SECURITY COUNCIL. IT WOULD BE ILLOGICAL, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THE COUNCIL TO TAKE THE POSITION THAT THE PLO SHOULD BECOME A PARTY TO THE GENEVA

NEGOTIATIONS WHEN IT CONTINUES TO REJECT THE PRINCIPLES AND RESOLUTIONS ON WHICH THOSE NEGOTIATIONS ARE BASED.

7. WE ARE APPROACHING THE CURRENT SC MEETING PREPARED TO HEAR WHAT OTHERS PROPOSE AND DETERMINED TO CONTINUE OUR EFFORTS AFTER THE COUNCIL MEETING, BEGINNING WITH THE TALKS WE EXPECT TO HAVE WITH PM RABIN THE END OF THIS MONTH. AT THE SAME TIME, WE HAVE FELT IT IMPORTANT TO ASSURE THERE IS NO MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE LIMITS BEYOND WHICH WE DO NOT FEEL WE CAN GO IF WE ARE TO RETAIN THE ABILITY TO PURSUE THE PEACEMAKING ROLE WHICH IS UNIQUELY OURS. THIS MAY REQUIRE ACTIONS BY US IN NEW YORK WITH WHICH OUR ARAB FRIENDS DO NOT AGREE, BUT WE WANT THEM TO KNOW OUR POSITION AND THE REASON FOR IT. WE WILL BE ACTING ACCORDING TO OUR BEST JUDGMENT OF WHAT SERVES US INTERESTS IN KEEPING OPEN THE POSSIBILITY FOR PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE.

8. IF QUESTION OF OUR VOTE AGAINST PLO PARTICIPATION IN CURRENT DEBATE IS RAISED, YOU SHOULD STRESS THAT OUR POSITION WAS BASED ON UN CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS -- NAMELY OUR STRONG FEELING THAT COUNCIL SHOULD NOT SET UNDESIRABLE PRECEDENT, IN VIOLATION OF ITS OWN CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 010929

RULES, OF SEATING A NON-GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY, WHETHER THE PLO OR ANY OTHER, IN THE CAPACITY ALWAYS RESERVED IN THE PAST FOR MEMBER GOVERNMENTS OF THE UN. WE VOTED FOR THIS SC MEETING TO BE HELD, BUT BELIEVE THE PROPER PROCEDURE WOULD HAVE BEEN FOR THE PLO TO BE HEARD UNDER RULE 39 (NON-GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES) WHICH EXISTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PERMITTING THE COUNCIL TO HEAR RELEVANT STATEMENTS FROM QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS BUT DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR THEIR CONTINUING PRESENCE AT THE COUNCIL TABLE DURING THE DEBATE WITH THE PREROGATIVE OF RIGHTS OF REPLY. KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, ARBITRATION, POLITICAL SETTLEMENT, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 16 JAN 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976STATE010929  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** ALATHERTON, JR./HLK  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760016-1199  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19760149/aaaabrle.tel  
**Line Count:** 165  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN NEA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 06 MAY 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <06 MAY 2004 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <27 SEP 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** U.S. POSITION IN CURRENT UNSC DEBATE ON MIDDLE EAST  
**TAGS:** PFOR, XF, US, UNSC  
**To:** ALL POSTS  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006